

## REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in view of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in the present application. New claims 21 and 22 are added by the present amendment.

Initially, it is noted that a circuit design system is taught in which delay information is presumed from modified circuit information without performing a design layout, when a timing error is recognized by a timing test (see page 7, line 16 to page 8, line 6). As an advantage, delay information can be immediately presumed from the modified circuit information to recover the timing error without the delay required by designing the layout every time the circuit information is modified (see page 8, lines 2-6).

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-11 and 14-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over U.S. patent number 5,508,937 to Abato. This rejection is respectfully traversed at least because Abato does not teach or suggest presuming delay information from modified circuit information without designing layout, as in the independent claims.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a design system of an integrated circuit including "...a delay presumption portion presuming the delay information from the modified circuit information without designing layout with the circuit information modified in said circuit modification portion..." Independent claims 7, 10, 14, 16 and 19 include similar features.

In contrast, Abato merely discusses at column 3, lines 52-53 a method including "...modifying the given integrated circuit layout to produce the modified version thereof..." Therefore, the method of Abato requires designing circuit layout each time a circuit is modified, which is incompatible with and different from the independent claims in which delay information is presumed "without designing layout." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 7, 10, 14, 16 and 19 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Abato.

Claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Abato and U.S. patent application publication number 2001/0010090 A1 to Boyle. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5, 6, 12 and 13 depend from independent claims 1 and 10, respectively, which as discussed are believed to distinguish over Abato. Further, it is respectfully submitted Boyle also

does not teach or suggest presuming delay information without designing a layout, as in the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, new claims 21 and 22 are added to set forth the invention in a varying scope. New claim 21 is similar to claim 10, but is drafted not to be interpreted under 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. Also, new claim 22 includes similar features to claim 10, and is supported in the specification at least at page 7, lines 16-21. New claims 21 and 22 are believed to be allowable at least for similar reasons as claim 10, and it is believed no new matter is added.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion no further issues are believed to be outstanding and it is earnestly requested this case pass to issue.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 25, 2004

By: Ryan Rafferty  
Ryan Rafferty  
Registration No. 55,556

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 454-1589  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501